DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 368 147 EC 302 908

TITLE	Gifted Education Program Descriptive Summary Report: School Year 1991-92.
INSTITUTION	Illinois State Board of Education, Springfield, Dept. of Planning, Research and Evaluation.
PUB DATE	Nov 93
NOTE	54p.
PUB TYPE	Reports - Descriptive (141) -- Statistical Data (110)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Ability Identification; Delivery Systems; Elementary Secondary Education; Ethnic Groups; *Financial Support; *Gifted; Minority Groups; Program Evaluation; *Special Education; Staff Development; *State Programs; *Student Characteristics
IDENTIFIERS	*Illinois

ABSTRACT

This report provides descriptive data and analyses of information concerning Illinois public school gifted education programs, gathered via the fiscal year 1992 Gifted Education Program Evaluation Report. The report describes the student population, program type and content, staff training, and funding during school year 1991-92. Highlights of the findings include: (1) during 1991-92, 167,974 Illinois elementary and secondary students were identified as gifted/talented; (2) identified students comprised 9 percent of the total public school enrollment; (3) Blacks and Hispanic students comprised higher percentages of overall enrollment than gifted enrollment, while the reverse was true for Asian students; (4) elementary level classes were primarily enrichment, either in pull-out or regular classroom settings, while secondary-level classes were primarily of the accelerated type; (5) almost all school districts reported participation in staff training related to gifted education; (6) state expenditures for gifted education represented 15 percent of total reported expenditures; (7) females outnumbered males in gifted education by 52.4 percent to 47.9 percent. Appendixes contain a copy of the reporting form, definitions of terms, and program content codes. (JDD)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

ED 368 147

GIFTED EDUCATION PROGRAM
DESCRIPTIVE SUMMARY REPORT
SCHOOL YEAR 1991-92

ILLINOIS STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION
Department of Planning, Research and Evaluation

November 1993

Michael W. Skarr
Chairperson
State Board of Education

Robert Leininger
State Superintendent
of Education

EC 302908

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Nancy Spooner
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

FOREWORD

The Illinois State Board of Education directed staff to conduct an evaluation of the Gifted Education Programs. This report was prepared by Nancy Spinner, MBA, of the Department of Planning, Research and Evaluation and includes information about services provided to students during the regular school term, 1991-92. The interpretations and conclusions expressed herein have been prepared by staff and do not necessarily reflect the position or the policy of the Illinois State Board of Education. For further information, please contact the Department of Planning, Research and Evaluation at 217-782-3950.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
Executive Summary	1
Introduction	4
Findings	5
Student Demographics and Characteristics	5
Program Design and Content	13
Staff Training	23
Funding	25
Summary and Conclusions	27
Appendix A	29
Appendix B	37
Appendix C	38

TABLE OF TABLES

		Page
Table 1:	Number and Percent of Students Identified by Gifted Category and Grade Level	6
Table 2:	Number and Percent of Students Participating by Grade Level: Students Identified Compared to Students Participating	7
Table 3:	Students Identified Compared with Students Participating	8
Table 4:	Methods Used for Student Recruitment	9
Table 5:	Methods Used for Screening, Selection and Placement	10
Table 6:	Number and Percent of Gifted and Public School Students by Racial/Ethnic Group	12
Table 7:	Gifted Education Program Students by Gender and Grade Level	13
Table 8:	Number and Percent of Gifted Students Participating by Grade Level and Learning Area	15
Table 9A:	Percent of Accelerated Gifted Programs by Learning Area and Instructional Setting	17
Table 9B:	Percent of Enrichment Gifted Programs by Learning Area and Instructional Setting	18
Table 10A:	Percent of Accelerated Gifted Programs by Learning Area and Hours per Week	19
Table 10B:	Percent of Enrichment Gifted Programs by Learning Area and Hours per Week	20
Table 11A:	Percent of Accelerated Gifted Programs by Learning Area and Weeks per Year	21
Table 11B:	Percent of Enrichment Gifted Programs by Learning Area and Weeks per Year	22
Table 12:	Number of District Personnel Receiving Staff Training by Training Provider and Funding Source	24
Table 13:	Number of District Staff Allocated to the Gifted Program	25
Table 14:	Reported Expenditures for Gifted Education by Funding Source	26

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This report provides descriptive data and analyses of information gathered via the FY 92 Gifted Education Program Evaluation Report (ISBE #41-61). All 948 Illinois public school districts participated in the gifted education program, with 19 districts reporting participation as "planning year only--no students served." (In FY 91, 21 districts reported "Planning Years.") In addition, one hundred and forty-one (141) districts joined together in 19 cooperatives (joint agreements). One district did not submit an evaluation form. This report describes the student population, program type and content, staff training, and funding of Illinois gifted education during school year 1991-92.

The following are brief highlights of the findings:

* **During 1991-92, 167,974 Illinois elementary and secondary students were identified as gifted/talented**. About 20% of the students identified were in grades K-3, approximately 50% were in grades 4-8, and approximately 30% were in grades 9-12. (See Table 1 on page 6.) In grades kindergarten through six, greater than 50% were identified under the category of "general intellectual ability." This compares with grades seven through twelve where more than half of the students were identified in the category "specific aptitude/talent."

* **Students identified as gifted/talented comprised 9% of the total public school enrollment.** There were 1,848,166 students enrolled in public schools. Of that number, 167,974 students were identified as gifted/talented. (See Table 1 on page 6 and Table 6 on page 12.)

* **The number of students participating in Gifted Education programs as a percent of the total public school enrollment was 8.9% in FY 92**. Districts reported that 166,234 students participated in 1991-92. Approximately one-half of the students participating were in grades K-6. (See Table 2 on page 7.)

* **The number of students identified and the number of students participating increased when comparing FY 91 to FY 92**. In FY 91, 162,246 students were identified as gifted; this compares with 167,974 in FY 92, an increase of 3.5%. In FY 91, 157,881 students participated in the Gifted Education program; this compares with 166,234 students in FY 92 and represents an increase in gifted enrollment of 5.3%. (See Table 1 on page 6 and Table 2 on page 7.)

* **Gifted enrollment compared to the public school enrollment shows some variations in the racial/ethnic distribution.** The data show that 77.6% of gifted students were white compared to an overall enrollment of white students in public schools of 65.2%. Black students comprised 12.3% of gifted enrollment compared to 21.5% overall. Hispanic students comprised 4.2% of gifted enrollment and 10.4% of the overall student enrollment. Asian students were

5.9% of gifted enrollment and 2.8% of public school enrollment. American Indian/Alaskan students comprised 0.1% of the gifted enrollment and 0.1% of the overall enrollment. (See Table 6 on page 12.)

* **Female students outnumber males in gifted education by 52.4% to 47.6%.** By grade level, there is slight deviation from the overall ratio. Male enrollment exceeds the overall average of 47.6% in grades kindergarten through eight. Grades eight through twelve have more female students than the overall average female enrollment in gifted education. (See Table 7 on page 13.)

* **Student participation by learning area varied widely**. Student participation by learning area was reported (duplicated counts) as follows: 61.0% in language arts; 51.3% in mathematics; 32.1% in biological/physical sciences; 28.4% in social sciences; 18.9% in fine arts; 10.3% in physical development and health; and 10.2% in foreign language. (See Table 8 on page 15.)

* **Gifted programs vary by program type**. Classes at the elementary level are primarily enrichment and are held most frequently in pull-out or regular classroom settings. At the secondary level, classes are primarily of the accelerated type and are held in special gifted class and regular education instructional settings. (See Table 9A on page 17 and Table 9B on page 18.)

* **Gifted classes were most frequently provided for five hours per week**. Districts reported that irrespective of grade level and/or program type (accelerated vs enrichment), gifted classes were provided most often for five hours per week. (See Table 10A on page 19 and Table 10B on page 20.)

* **The majority of gifted programs were provided for 28 or more weeks per year**. Irrespective of program type or grade level, gifted classes were provided for the majority of the school year -- greater than 28 weeks. (See Table 11A on page 21 and Table 11B on page 22.)

* **Almost all Illinois districts (99.8%) reported participation in staff training related to gifted education.** Irrespective of training provider, teachers were the primary recipients of staff development. Few districts reported providing staff training to aides/assistants (5.9%), counselors/psychologists (12.9%) and support staff (4.9%). (See Table 12 on page 24.)

* **State expenditures for gifted education represented 15.0% of total reported expenditures.** Reported state expenditures were $10,049,851. Ninety-one percent of the districts chose the formula method of reimbursement, while 9% used the personnel method. State expenditures increased by 3.5% compared to those reported in fiscal year 1991. (See Table 14 on page 26.)

* **Reported expenditures from local revenues were $56,026,761.** Local revenues comprised 83.8% of expenditures for gifted education and increased by 6.9% from FY 91. (See Table 14 on page 26.)

* **<u>Total</u> reported expenditures for gifted education were $66,893,598.** This is an increase of 27.6% over expenditures reported in FY 91. (See Table 14 on page 26.)

* **Gifted enrollment increased, and reported expenditures increased.** Students participating in gifted education programs increased by 4.9% from FY 91 to FY 92 (from 157,881 to 166,234). Reported total expenditures increased by 27.6% from $52,413,227 in FY 91 to $66,893,598 in FY 92. (See Table 2 on page 7 and Table 14 on page 26.)

INTRODUCTION

Gifted education programs have been in existence in Illinois public schools since 1963. In the program's initial year, there were 55 participating districts. The program has grown dramatically since its infancy. Effective during the 1988-89 school year, the Illinois General Assembly, via Public Act 85-880, required each school district to develop a comprehensive plan that provides or makes available gifted education programs which encompass all grade levels and fundamental areas of learning. Full implementation of this legislation was scheduled for the 1991-92 school year and was conditional on acceptance by the Governor and the General Assembly of a funding formula to be developed and submitted by the State Board of Education (Ill. Rev. Stat. 1989 Ch. 122, Par. 14A-3.1). Nine hundred and forty-eight (948) public districts were operational and serving students when the Gifted Education Program Evaluation Report (Form ISBE #41-61) was distributed in the spring of 1992. The types of gifted education service providers are summarized below:

single districts	788
joint agreements (19 representing 141 districts)	141
planning--no students served	19
Total	948

One district did not return an evaluation form by mid-October 1992; the student/program data from that district are not included in this year's report. The overall response rate is 99.9%.

During FY 92, nineteen districts were only involved in planning. One hundred forty-one school districts served students in a multi-district cooperative (joint agreement) program. The remaining 788 districts offered single-district programs. Districts reported that they **identified** 167,974 students as gifted and that 166,234 gifted students were served in Illinois public schools.

All public school districts are required to submit an annual evaluation report, a comprehensive plan which includes details of the gifted education program offered, and claims for reimbursement to the Illinois State Board of Education. This report presents a description of the Gifted Education program based upon information submitted via evaluation and reimbursement reports. The following evaluation questions are addressed:

* What are the demographic characteristics of students who were **identified** and **participated** in the FY 92 Illinois Gifted Education Program?

* What are the program designs most frequently used in Illinois?

* Do gifted programs encompass all grade levels and fundamental areas of learning?

* How many district personnel received staff training, and how was the training most often delivered?

* What was the reported level of state financial support? What was the level of funding from local sources?

FINDINGS

Findings from the 947 forms that were submitted are presented and analyzed in the tables and narrative that follow.

Student Demographics and Characteristics

How many students were identified, and how many subsequently participated in the FY 92 gifted education programs in Illinois?

Table 1 shows the number and percent of students statewide who were **identified** by gifted category and grade level. Definitions of the gifted categories "general intellectual ability" and "specific aptitude/talent" are included in Appendix B.

During FY 92, 947 public school districts **identified** 167,974 (8.9 percent of the total public school enrollment) students as gifted/talented. The process/criteria used for identifying gifted students is determined at the local district level. However, students are identified as gifted/talented in accordance with the definitions which appear in 23 Illinois Administrative Code, Section 227.10 and are included in this report in Appendix B.

Table 1 also shows that slightly more than one-half of Illinois' gifted students (50.9%) were **identified** under the criteria of general intellectual ability. Slightly more than one-fifth of those students **identified** were in grades kindergarten through third (20.65%). This compares with 48.88% of the students **identified** in grades 4 through 8, and 30.47% in high school grades 9 through 12.

For grades kindergarten through six, districts reported that over 50% of the students in each grade level were **identified** under the definition of general intellectual ability (See Appendix B). The reverse is true for students in grades 7 through 12--more than 50% in each grade level were **identified** under the definition of specific aptitude/talent. This proportion increases at each grade level through grade 12, where approximately two-thirds of gifted students (65.76%) are identified using the criteria of specific aptitude/talent. By contrast, 65.32% of kindergarten students were identified under the definition of general intellectual ability.

Table 1: Number and Percent of Students **Identified** by Gifted Category and Grade Level

Grade Level	General Intellectual Ability		Specific Aptitude/ Talent		Total Number by Grade	Percent by Grade	Cumulative Percent
	#	%	#	%	#	%	%
K	1,678	65.32	891	34.68	2,569	1.53	1.53
1	4,459	62.93	2,627	37.07	7,086	4.22	5.75
2	6,779	62.55	4,059	37.45	10,838	6.45	12.20
3	8,830	62.20	5,367	37.80	14,197	8.45	20.65
4	9,489	61.69	5,893	38.31	15,382	9.16	29.81
5	9,931	60.99	6,351	39.01	16,282	9.69	39.50
6	8,798	53.26	7,720	46.74	16,518	9.83	49.33
7	7,579	45.58	9,050	54.42	16,629	9.90	59.23
8	7,520	43.48	9,776	56.52	17,296	10.30	69.53
9	5,785	44.77	7,137	55.23	12,922	7.69	77.22
10	5,022	42.10	6,908	57.90	11,930	7.10	84.32
11	4,834	38.65	7,672	61.35	12,506	7.45	91.77
12	4,731	34.24	9,088	65.76	13,819	8.23	100.00
Total	85,435		82,539		167,974		
Percent of Total Population		(50.9%)		(49.1%)		100%	

Table 2 shows the number of students **participating** in the FY 92 Gifted Program by grade level. The total number of students **participating** (166,234) represents 8.99% of the public school enrollment.

Table 2: Number and Percent of Students Participating by Grade Level: Students Identified Compared to Students Participating

Grade Level	Percent Participating by Grade Level	Cumulative Percent Participating	Number Participating by Grade Level	Number Identified by Grade Level	Difference
K	1.53	1.53	2,545	2,569	24
1	4.30	5.83	7,140	7,086	(54)
2	6.47	12.30	10,759	10,838	79
3	8.32	20.62	13,838	14,197	359
4	9.05	29.67	15,050	15,382	332
5	9.44	39.11	15,696	16,282	586
6	9.96	48.84	16,182	16,518	336
7	9.96	58.80	16,552	16,629	77
8	10.63	69.43	17,663	17,296	(367)
9	7.64	77.07	12,700	12,922	222
10	7.14	84.21	11,867	11,930	63
11	7.54	91.75	12,538	12,506	(32)
12	8.25	100.00	13,704	13,819	115
Total	100%		166,234	167,974	1,740

NOTE: In the "Difference" column, numbers in parentheses represent a greater number of students participating compared to the number of students identified at that grade level (grades 1, 8 and 11).

Table 2 shows the number of students **identified,** and the number of students **participating** by grade level in the FY 92 Gifted Program. Grades 1, 8, and 11 had a greater number of students participating when compared with students identified at the same grade level. This could occur if students are identified as gifted at the end of a school year and participation begins the following term. Another possible explanation is conflict in a student's schedule and/or insufficient space/resources to serve all students identified so students are placed on a waiting list and served when schedule/space permits.

A comparison with FY 91 data shows that more students were **identified** and more students **participated** in gifted programs this year. The number of students **identified** as gifted increased from 162,246 to 167,974 students, an increase of 3.5%. The number of students **participating** increased 5.3% from 157,881 students in FY 91, to 166,234 in FY 92.

In FY 91, 8.9% of the public school enrollment was **identified** as gifted. This compares with 9.1% identified as gifted in FY 92. The FY 91 data showed that 8.7% of public school students **participated** in gifted programs. This compares with 9.0% in FY 92.

Approximately thirty percent of students **participating** were in grades kindergarten through 4 (29.67%), approximately one-fifth (19.17%) were in grades 5 and 6, and slightly more than one-half (51.16%) were in grades 7 through 12. (See Table 2.)

In instances where there were more or fewer students identified compared with students participating at any grade level, districts were required to explain the discrepancy. Table 3 shows the reasons cited by districts for the discrepancy between students identified versus students participating.

Table 3: Students Identified Compared with Students Participating

Reason	Percent of Responses
Voluntary student withdrawal	12.44
Parent/guardian withdrawal	4.64
Moved out of district	6.49
Transferred to a nonpublic school	.01
Dropped out	2.32
Insufficient staff to conduct program	28.67
Insufficient resources	13.00
Other	32.43
	100%

As an example, 12.44% of the discrepancy is due to voluntary student withdrawal, while 28.67% is due to insufficient staff to conduct the program. The highest percentage of responses (32.43%) were specified as "other." Reasons specified are listed below:

- Services offered through the regular classroom.
- Failure to meet program requirements.
- Met general criteria but not for math.
- Classroom behavior was poor.
- Parent did not sign and return parent permission sheet.
- Lack of sufficient space for a resource room.
- Scheduling conflict.
- Lack of interest and wished to spend more time on regular classwork.
- Funding available only for certain classes and grades.
- Student identification matrix scores high--but still did not meet identification cut-off score.
- Low performance.
- Did not maintain minimal standards of performance.

Beginning in school year 1991-92, districts were asked to identify the methods used for student recruitment as well as screening, selection and placement of students. Table 4 shows the methods used to recruit students for the gifted program. A district may use one or all of these methods, so these data are duplicate counts. Almost all districts (96.9%) reported that students were recruited through referral by district staff, and 73.4% reported that students were recruited by parent/guardian referral. Greater than one-third of the districts (37.5%) recruited students through district publications, and 25.6% of districts cited self-referral for student recruitment.

Table 4: Methods Used for Student Recuitment

Method	Percent of Districts
District publications	37.5
Newspaper	6.7
Radio	1.2
Television	0.7
Public/philanthropic group (social service agency, church)	0.9
Referred by district staff	96.9
Referred by parent/guardian	73.4
Self-referral	25.6
Other	18.2

Table 5: Methods Used for Screening, Selection and Placement

Method	Percent of Districts
Teacher-made test	20.9
Specific subject matter test	30.0
Achievement test subscores	96.4
Creativity test	9.0
Pictorial/nonverbal/abstract reasoning test	10.6
Individual intelligence test	30.4
Group/verbal intelligence or mental ability test	65.2
Rating scale	36.5
Teacher/specialist professional judgment	92.8
Past school performance	78.8
Student accomplishment/ability (portfolio, audition, performance)	34.3

Districts also reported the methods used for screening, selection and placement of gifted students. These data are presented in Table 5. Almost all districts (96.4%) used achievement test subscores and teacher/specialist professional judgment (92.8%). Over three-quarters of districts (78.8%) used past school performance, and about two-thirds of the districts (65.2%), used group/verbal intelligence or mental ability tests to screen, select and/or place students in gifted programs. Methods used least often were pictorial/nonverbal/abstract reasoning tests (10.6%), and creativity tests (9.0%). These data are presented in Table 5.

In the fall of 1993, the Illinois State Board of Education contracted with Evaluation Systems Design, Inc., of Tallahassee, Florida, for the purpose of conducting an evaluation of the Illinois Gifted Education Program. Several findings were reported as a result of statewide collected and analyzed data relative to student identification, screening, selection and placement. The pertinent findings are summarized below:

* Districts report that the screening methods they use are multi-faceted and involve both objective and subjective judgments.

* Ninety percent of districts use achievement tests for screening.

* Eighty-one percent of districts use behavior checklists completed by teachers, counselors, or other district staff.

* Seventy percent of districts use other assessment measures such as IQ, creativity, portfolios, writing samples and auditions.

* Committee review and evaluation of available information (including use of a matrix) was reported by fifty-four percent of districts.

* The two most commonly used screening processes are a census standardized achievement test (given to all students) and teacher recommendation.

* Screening criteria for standardized achievement tests range from the 80th percentile to the 90th percentile.

* Some districts use the total test battery; others require students to achieve the cut score (defined by the district) on all subtests.

* In districts where the use of standardized achievement tests has been eliminated due to declining budgets and/or shifts in philosophies, heavier reliance is being placed on subjective measures for screening.

* Many districts are using identification systems that do not consider the special needs of minority and disadvantaged students. This may contribute to an overrepresentation of whites and Asians (compared to the general public school enrollment) in gifted education programs in Illinois (and in the nation at large) and an underrepresentation of blacks and Hispanics.

These findings were presented to the State Board of Education in May 1993. They are included here to encourage program administrators to examine existing screening selection and placement practices. These findings are guidelines; they are not mandates. Evaluation Systems Design, Inc., made the following recommendations based upon their findings:

* The Illinois State Board of Education should require all districts to implement a screening process that includes census testing.

* Districts should implement outreach programs that target minority and disadvantaged families. Such programs should begin in preschool, e.g. Head Start.

* The Illinois State Board of Education should provide operational definitions of "gifted" and "talented."

* The Illinois State Board of Education should develop guidelines in identification processes and encourage districts to implement them.

* Census screening (of all students) should include a standardized objective measure.

* Regular education teachers and administrators should receive training in identifying gifted students.

* Selection should be based upon multiple criteria.

* Screening/placement processes should ensure that disadvantaged students are enrolled in proportion to their community representation.

* Nonverbal tests should be used to identify students with abilities that are not measured well by verbal IQ tests.

* Reevaluation of students enrolled in gifted programs should occur no less often than every three years.

Some disparities exist in the racial/ethnic distribution of gifted enrollment when compared to the total enrollment. There are significantly greater percentages of white and Asian students in gifted programs compared to the public school enrollments of white and Asian students. The gifted enrollments are significantly lower for Hispanic and black students when compared to the statewide enrollment of black and Hispanic students. These data suggest that districts should assess eligibility criteria as well as methods for screening selection and placement in order to assure equal access for all students.

Table 6 shows the number and percent of FY 92 gifted enrollment by racial/ethnic distribution, the public school enrollment by racial/ethnic distribution, and a comparison of gifted and public school enrollments. Of the 166,234 students enrolled in gifted education, 77.6% were white. This compares with an overall white student enrollment of 65.2%. Black students comprised 12.3% of the gifted enrollment and 21.5% of the public school enrollment. The Asian enrollment in gifted education was reported as 5.9%, compared with 2.8% Asian enrollment in Illinois public schools. The Hispanic enrollment in gifted programs was 4.2%, compared with an overall Hispanic enrollment of 10.4%. The enrollment of American Indian/Alaskan students in gifted education is identical to the overall enrollment of students in this racial/ethnic group--0.1%.

Table 6: Number and Percent of Gifted and Public School Students by Racial/Ethnic Group

Racial/Ethnic Group	Gifted Enrollment	Percent of Gifted Enrollment	Public School Enrollment	Percent of Public School Enrollment
White	128,942	77.6	1,205,669	65.2
Black	20,395	12.3	397,490	21.5
Hispanic	6,909	4.2	191,094	10.4
Asian	9,772	5.9	51,482	2.8
American Indian/ Alaskan	216	.1	2,431	.1
Total	166,234	100.1	1,848,166	100.0

NOTE: Data regarding public school enrollments are taken from the Fall Housing Report for School Year 1991-92.

Percentages may not total 100% due to rounding.

Table 7 displays data on gifted education program students by gender and grade level. The male/female enrollment is 47.6% to 52.4%; this percentage has remained fairly consistent over the past several program years. As an example, during school year 1989-90, the male/female percentages were 47.5% to 52.5%. There is some variation by grade level of the distribution by gender. For grades kindergarten through five (and grade seven), the percentage of male students at each grade level is higher than the aggregate male enrollment of 46.9%. The sixth grade has the highest divergence in gender--43.4% male and 56.6% female. The percentage of male students does not exceed the percentage of female students at any grade level.

Table 7: Gifted Education Program Students by Gender and Grade Level

Grade Level	Male		Female		Grade Total
	#	%	#	%	
K	1,229	48.29	1,316	51.71	2,545
1	3,512	49.19	3,628	50.81	7,140
2	5,197	48.30	5,562	51.70	10,759
3	6,741	48.71	7,097	51.29	13,838
4	7,255	48.21	7,795	51.79	15,050
5	7,739	49.31	7,957	50.69	15,696
6	7,817	48.31	8,365	51.69	16,182
7	7,905	47.76	8,647	52.24	16,552
8	8,277	46.86	9,386	53.14	17,663
9	5,881	46.31	6,819	53.69	12,700
10	5,423	45.70	6,444	54.30	11,867
11	5,834	46.53	6,704	53.47	12,538
12	6,305	46.01	7,399	53.99	13,704
Total	79,115	47.59	87,119	52.41	166,234

Program Design and Content

What are the program designs most frequently used in Illinois Gifted Education?

Table 8 shows the number of gifted students participating by grade level and learning area. Students may participate in as few as one or as many as seven of the learning areas. The curricula for Illinois gifted students include six fundamental learning areas: 1) Language Arts, 2) Mathematics, 3) Biological/Physical Sciences, 4) Social Sciences, 5) Fine Arts, and 6) Physical Development and Health. Foreign languages and multidisciplinary classes are also offered to gifted students. A multidisciplinary class is a combination of at least two learning areas, but it does not fit the specific definition of either. One example is high school journalism (Language Arts and Fine Arts). Another example is an elementary anthropology-writing class--observing a family of monkeys in a zoo environment and writing a paper on the group interaction (Language Arts and Sciences).

Gifted classes are either accelerated or enriched. These data show that more than half of gifted students participated in language arts (61.03%), and mathematics (51.3%). Approximately one-third of gifted students (32.18%) were enrolled in biological/physical sciences, and 28.4% took social science courses. Slightly less than one-fifth of gifted students were enrolled in fine arts (18.9%), and 22.5% participated in multidisciplinary programs. Only 10.2% of gifted students took foreign language courses, and 10.3% took classes in physical development and health.

Appendix C contains a listing of the reported course offerings.

Table 8: Number and Percent of Gifted Students Participating by Grade Level and Learning Area

Grade Level	Language Arts	Mathematics	Bio/Phys Science	Social Science	Fine Arts	Physical Dev & Health	Foreign Language	Multi-disciplinary	Total
K	1,881	1,221	509	483	655	61	530	764	2,545
1	4,802	3,339	1,593	1,941	1,892	430	1,137	2,584	7,140
2	6,924	5,092	2,535	2,868	2,344	526	1,371	3,941	10,759
3	8,442	6,739	3,081	3,352	2,667	583	1,295	5,064	13,838
4	9,475	7,808	3,735	4,102	3,117	645	1,528	5,383	15,050
5	9,915	8,210	4,068	4,455	3,622	733	1,617	5,255	15,696
6	10,344	9,008	4,606	4,706	3,657	697	1,596	4,195	16,182
7	10,761	9,438	5,866	5,021	3,317	1,814	1,882	2,521	16,552
8	10,661	9,831	5,735	5,226	3,154	2,059	1,820	2,407	17,663
9	7,463	6,665	5,782	3,851	1,381	1,896	985	1,291	12,700
10	6,969	6,044	5,108	2,944	1,515	2,056	951	1,259	11,867
11	6,657	5,732	5,035	4,304	1,747	2,692	1,100	1,341	12,538
12	7,192	6,103	5,657	3,987	2,258	2,948	1,165	1,394	13,704
Total by Learning Area	101,486	85,230	53,310	47,240	31,326	17,140	16,977	37,399	166,234
Percent by Learning Area	61.0	51.3	32.1	28.4	18.9	10.3	10.2	22.5	

Tables 9A and 9B show gifted programs by program type (accelerated and enrichment), learning area and instructional setting. Gifted education offers two program types--accelerated and enrichment. These definitions are included on the Gifted Education Program Evaluation Report in Appendix A and Appendix B. An acceleration program provides students a curriculum at an earlier age, at a more advanced level, and at a faster pace than would be offered in a traditional sequence. The enrichment program provides for the study of special themes or topics in greater intensity requiring higher level thinking skills.

Accelerated language arts programs were more often offered at the secondary level (60.06%) than at the elementary level (39.94%) (Table 9A). By contrast, enrichment language arts programs were more often offered at the elementary level (62.64%) than at the secondary level (37.36%) (Table 9B). At the elementary level, gifted programs were primarily of the enrichment type, except for the learning area of physical development and health and foreign language (Table 9B). By contrast, secondary gifted programs were primarily of the accelerated program type with the exception of multidisciplinary classes (Table 9A).

Gifted instruction is offered in one of four instructional settings: pull-out class (students are "pulled out" of the regular class and provided differentiated instruction in another setting); self-contained (a classroom for gifted students staffed by a specially trained person); special class (gifted students are taught a departmentalized subject); and regular class (differentiated instruction is provided in the regular class). These definitions are included in Appendix B.

Accelerated gifted classes at the elementary level are most often provided in the pull-out instructional setting or in the regular classroom. By contrast, accelerated classes at the secondary level are most often delivered in the instructional setting of a special class (Table 9A).

Elementary-level enrichment programs (Table 9B) are provided in the pull-out class or in the regular classroom. Enrichment classes at the secondary level are provided most frequently in the regular classroom setting.

Table 9A: Percent of Accelerated Gifted Programs by Learning Area and Instructional Setting

Learning Area	Instructional Setting				
	Pull-Out %	Self-Cont. %	Spec. Class %	Regular %	All Elementary %
Elementary					
Language Arts	12.26	5.23	9.48	12.97	39.94
Mathematics	10.16	4.07	8.85	11.19	34.29
Biological/Phys Science	9.10	6.26	4.61	5.67	25.65
Social Science	11.38	6.83	4.90	9.11	32.22
Fine Arts	6.76	1.62	7.84	11.89	28.11
Physical Devel & Health	0.00	7.74	8.39	21.94	38.06
Foreign Language	2.73	2.19	4.10	4.37	13.39
Multidisciplinary	20.79	12.11	9.47	18.42	60.79
Secondary					**All Secondary**
Language Arts	3.23	6.84	32.71	17.29	60.06
Mathematics	3.75	6.46	36.72	18.78	65.71
Biological/Phys Science	4.02	11.58	40.90	17.85	74.35
Social Science	4.38	9.11	36.43	17.86	67.78
Fine Arts	7.30	5.95	29.19	29.46	71.89
Physical Devel & Health	1.29	9.03	20.65	30.97	61.94
Foreign Language	4.10	12.02	37.70	32.79	86.61
Multidisciplinary	7.37	1.84	14.74	15.26	39.21

Table 9B: Percent of Enrichment Gifted Programs by Learning Area and Instructional Setting

Learning Area	Instructional Setting				
	Pull-Out %	Self-Cont. %	Spec. Class %	Regular %	All Elementary %
Elementary					
Language Arts	28.93	3.68	5.72	24.30	62.64
Mathematics	29.45	5.01	5.68	27.27	67.41
Biological/Phys Science	26.33	3.84	4.24	22.61	57.01
Social Science	25.26	3.97	4.74	21.99	55.96
Fine Arts	24.91	3.97	6.14	16.97	51.99
Physical Devel & Health	10.27	4.40	2.20	26.65	43.52
Foreign Language	15.71	3.14	3.14	4.97	26.96
Multidisciplinary	45.34	3.25	3.11	15.64	67.34
Secondary					**All Secondary**
Language Arts	9.48	2.30	8.97	16.61	37.36
Mathematics	7.69	2.57	6.88	15.45	32.59
Biological/Phys Science	9.39	2.58	10.59	20.44	42.99
Social Science	10.83	2.88	9.62	20.71	44.04
Fine Arts	15.52	1.44	8.95	22.09	48.01
Physical Devel & Health	7.58	1.22	6.60	41.08	56.48
Foreign Language	10.47	3.93	20.42	38.22	73.04
Multidisciplinary	16.88	1.15	5.12	9.52	32.66

Tables 10A and 10B show gifted program data by learning area, program type (accelerated or enrichment), elementary versus secondary, and hours per week. The vast majority of gifted classes in all areas of learning were provided one to five hours per week at both the elementary and secondary level. Accelerated and enrichment programs were provided most frequently one to five class hours per week at the elementary and high school level.

Table 10A: Percent of Accelerated Gifted Programs by Learning Area and Hours per Week

Learning Area	Hours per Week					
	Less than 1 %	1 to 5 %	6 to 10 %	11 to 5 %	16 or more %	All Elementary %
Elementary						
Language Arts	2.32	29.29	5.68	0.58	2.06	39.94
Mathematics	1.78	28.06	2.90	0.00	1.55	34.29
Biological/Phys Science	2.13	19.98	1.30	0.00	2.25	25.65
Social Science	2.98	24.52	1.58	0.00	3.15	32.22
Fine Arts	0.00	25.14	2.97	0.00	0.00	28.11
Physical Devel & Health	0.00	35.48	2.58	0.00	0.00	38.06
Foreign Language	1.64	11.75	0.00	0.00	0.00	13.39
Multidisciplinary	1.58	40.53	7.37	0.00	11.32	60.79
Secondary						**All Secondary**
Language Arts	1.10	50.77	4.65	0.45	3.10	60.06
Mathematics	0.70	58.64	2.58	0.19	3.61	65.71
Biological/Phys Science	0.59	65.48	3.19	0.47	4.61	74.35
Social Science	0.53	58.84	3.15	0.70	4.55	67.78
Fine Arts	0.00	67.57	1.62	1.08	1.62	71.89
Physical Devel & Health	0.00	56.77	1.29	2.58	1.29	61.94
Foreign Language	0.27	77.87	0.55	1.09	6.83	86.61
Multidisciplinary	0.00	30.26	5.79	0.00	3.16	39.21

Table 10B: Percent of Enrichment Gifted Programs by Learning Area and Hours per Week

Learning Area	Hours per Week					
	Less than 1 %	1 to 5 %	6 to 10 %	11 to 5 %	16 or more %	All Elementary %
Elementary						
Language Arts	5.67	49.25	5.49	0.61	1.61	62.64
Mathematics	6.07	54.64	4.13	0.71	1.87	67.41
Biological/Phys Science	5.84	44.42	3.49	0.80	2.46	57.01
Social Science	5.13	45.26	3.14	0.26	2.18	55.96
Fine Arts	5.56	43.03	1.95	0.36	1.08	51.99
Physical Devel & Health	1.22	39.61	0.73	0.00	1.96	43.52
Foreign Language	1.83	24.87	0.00	0.00	0.26	26.96
Multidisciplinary	5.64	53.61	4.93	0.19	2.97	67.34
Secondary						**All Secondary**
Language Arts	2.56	30.87	2.81	0.26	0.87	37.36
Mathematics	2.40	27.13	1.94	0.28	0.85	32.59
Biological/Phys Science	3.72	35.66	1.95	0.57	1.09	42.99
Social Science	3.53	38.33	1.03	0.06	1.09	44.04
Fine Arts	4.26	38.70	4.04	0.07	0.94	48.01
Physical Devel & Health	0.24	51.59	2.93	0.00	1.71	56.48
Foreign Language	3.93	64.40	2.62	0.00	2.09	73.04
Multidisciplinary	3.92	24.63	3.01	0.00	1.10	32.66

Tables 11A and 11B show gifted program data by learning area, elementary versus secondary, program type (accelerated or enrichment) and weeks per year. For elementary and secondary programs and in all areas of learning, the majority of classes were provided 28 or more weeks per year. This finding holds for accelerated as well as enrichment classes.

The extent to which factors extraneous to the gifted program affect its program design and content are not known and are not within the scope of the annual evaluation in its current format. Such factors include overall availability of staff in regular education to include gifted students in their classes, the scheduling of classes in order to permit gifted students to participate in special gifted classes, and/or "extra" classes that may be designed specifically for them, etc. Two recommendations provided by Evaluation Systems Design, Inc. to the Illinois State Board of Education merit consideration relative to program design and content. They are:

- Provide a longer school day to meet the needs of gifted students.
- Encourage 50% time-in-program at the elementary level.

This approach provides a sufficient amount of time for an accelerated program, and also provides opportunities for peer socialization. In addition, districts utilizing this approach could serve greater numbers of gifted and talented youngsters.

Table 11A: Percent of Accelerated Gifted Programs by Learning Area and Weeks per Year

Learning Area	Weeks per Year					
	Less than 1 %	1 to 9 %	10 to 18 %	19 to 27 %	28 or more %	All Elementary %
Elementary						
Language Arts	0.13	3.55	2.39	2.71	31.16	39.94
Mathematics	0.09	2.11	1.73	1.26	29.09	34.29
Biological/Phys Science	0.00	3.78	2.96	1.30	17.61	25.65
Social Science	0.00	4.03	1.75	3.33	23.12	32.22
Fine Arts	0.00	3.24	1.62	3.51	19.73	28.11
Physical Devel & Health	0.00	3.87	2.58	0.00	31.61	38.06
Foreign Language	0.00	4.92	0.55	0.00	7.92	13.39
Multidisciplinary	0.00	6.84	1.84	0.00	52.11	60.79
Secondary						**All Secondary**
Language Arts	0.06	1.23	1.61	1.87	55.29	60.06
Mathematics	0.05	1.08	0.98	1.22	62.39	65.71
Biological/Phys Science	0.00	1.77	1.89	0.47	70.21	74.35
Social Science	0.00	1.05	1.58	1.93	63.22	67.78
Fine Arts	0.00	1.62	8.11	3.78	58.38	71.89
Physical Devel & Health	0.00	7.10	5.81	0.00	49.03	61.94
Foreign Language	0.00	1.64	1.64	0.27	83.06	86.61
Multidisciplinary	0.00	1.32	0.53	1.05	36.32	39.21

Table 11B: Percent of Enrichment Gifted Programs by Learning Area and Weeks per Year

Learning Area	Weeks per Year					
	Less than 1 %	1 to 9 %	10 to 18 %	19 to 27 %	28 or more %	All Elementary %
Elementary						
Language Arts	0.20	8.31	7.82	7.18	39.13	62.64
Mathematics	0.18	8.78	7.23	7.83	43.39	67.41
Biological/Phys Science	0.34	12.82	5.27	7.16	31.43	57.01
Social Science	0.19	11.09	5.45	4.74	34.49	55.96
Fine Arts	0.00	11.55	6.43	3.32	30.69	51.99
Physical Devel & Health	0.00	5.13	7.09	0.98	30.32	43.52
Foreign Language	0.00	8.64	3.93	1.05	13.35	26.96
Multidisciplinary	0.29	5.36	7.08	7.84	46.77	67.34
Secondary						**All Secondary**
Language Arts	0.15	3.96	3.99	4.09	25.17	37.36
Mathematics	0.07	3.53	3.07	3.81	22.12	32.59
Biological/Phys Science	0.17	5.72	3.09	4.06	29.94	42.99
Social Science	0.00	6.22	3.78	1.92	32.12	44.04
Fine Arts	0.14	7.80	5.85	3.03	31.19	48.01
Physical Devel & Health	0.00	4.16	5.62	3.67	43.03	56.48
Foreign Language	0.00	9.69	3.40	2.09	57.85	73.04
Multidisciplinary	0.48	3.92	4.30	3.73	20.23	32.66

Staff Training

To what extent did school personnel participate in staff training?
Who provided the training and how was it funded?

The Illinois State Board of Education's Gifted Education Policy Statement and Rules identify the conditions necessary to ensure educational opportunities for students enrolled in programs for the gifted and talented. To this end, administrators, teachers, and support personnel must be knowledgeable about the characteristics and educational needs of gifted and talented students. Districts are encouraged to provide or make available staff training for their employees who work with gifted and talented children. Such inservice opportunities may include specific training (i.e. identification of gifted/talented youngsters, discipline, self-esteem, accelerated/enrichment curriculum, assessment/placement of gifted students, etc.), workshops, conferences, or coursework relevant to gifted education.

Table 12 shows the number of district personnel receiving staff training by training provider and funding source. Teachers were the primary recipients of staff training, irrespective of the training provider. Almost all districts (99.8%) reported that teachers participated in staff training, which included 706 employees. For these teachers, the training providers were fairly evenly distributed among Educational Service Center (ESC), Local Educational Agencies (LEA), and State/Regional Conferences. The funding source for staff training provided to teachers was most often listed as "State." It should be noted that these are not unduplicated counts. That is, a teacher may have participated in staff training conducted by one or all of the training providers. Approximately one-half of districts (49.9%) reported that staff training was provided to coordinators. Three hundred and fifty-three (353) gifted coordinators received training provided most often by ESCs, state/regional conferences, and LEAs, and funded by state monies. Slightly more than two-fifths (43.0%) of districts reported that administrators were recipients of staff training (304 administrators), provided most often by ESCs and LEAs, and most often paid by state funds. Staff training was provided infrequently to counselors/psychologists, aides/assistants, and support staff.

In summary, staff training was reported as having been provided in descending order to teachers, gifted coordinators, administrators, counselors and psychologists, and to a minimal degree, support staff and aides/assistants.

Table 12: Number of District Personnel Receiving Staff Training by Training Provider and Funding Source

District Personnel	% District Reporting	# of Personnel	Training Provider			University Credit Courses	Funding Source			
			State/Reg. Conference	ESC	LEA		LEA	State	Federal	ESC
Teachers	99.8	706	469	494	464	195	117	394	22	178
Aides/ Assistants	5.9	42	13	11	29	3	4	18	0	3
Coordinators	49.9	353	223	272	201	52	33	205	6	96
Administrators	43.0	304	139	200	193	16	35	143	4	72
Counselors Psychologists	12.9	91	42	34	63	9	13	42	1	16
Support Staff	4.9	35	12	12	22	1	4	17	2	5

Districts were asked to report the number of staff who work with the gifted program (full-time equivalents). The counts are duplicated. That is, a staff member may work with the gifted program as a coordinator and as a teacher, or an employee could work as a coordinator and as an administrator. These data are shown in Table 13.

Districts reported that 39,558.7 Illinois public school teachers worked in the 1991-92 Gifted Education Program. These data were compared with data reported on the Teacher Service Record (TSR) for school year 1991-92, an annual data collection effort conducted by Illinois State Board of Education Research staff. The TSR data showed that 682.5 full-time equivalent employed teachers held gifted education endorsements. For those teachers, gifted represented their major assignment or gifted comprised at least one-third of their work day. This would suggest that a small percentage of teachers who worked with gifted students as reported on the gifted evaluation had gifted education as their primary teaching assignment. These data also suggest that the regular classroom teacher contributes significantly to the provision of services to gifted students. This finding is compatible with data reported in Tables 9A and 9B -- that the regular classroom is a frequently utilized instructional setting. There were also a large number of full-time equivalent gifted coordinators (1,928.9) and administrators (1,342.4).

Table 13: Number of District Staff Allocated to the Gifted Program

Staff	Number (FTE)
Teachers	39,558.7
Aides, Assistants	500.3
Coordinators	1,928.9
Administrators	1,342.4
Social Workers, Nurses, Counselors, Psychologists	670.8
Support Staff	487.5

Funding

What was the level of financial support for gifted education programs from state, federal, and local sources?

Public school districts that provide gifted education programs are eligible to receive reimbursement from state funds for expenditures in the provision of such services. Public districts and joint agreements claim reimbursement using one of two methods. The first, and most often utilized, is the formula method, which provides that districts can claim up to 5% of their average daily attendance (ADA) for reimbursement of state funds for expenditures for the current year. For FY 92, the per pupil guaranteed reimbursement rate was $122 as compared with $115 in FY 91. The adjusted reimbursement rate for those districts using the ADA method of reimbursement was $125.46.

The second method is the personnel method of reimbursement, which provides that districts can claim $5,000 for each full-time professional staff member, or $2,500 for each half-time professional who works for the gifted program. Districts have the option of choosing either method of reimbursement.

Data collected by the Reimbursements Section of the State Board of Education show that ninety-one percent (91%) of public districts chose the formula method of reimbursement. These districts served 89.3% of the students enrolled in the gifted program (148,462 of the 166,234 gifted students). By contrast, 9% of the districts chose the personnel method of reimbursement, with claims for 341.25 full-time equivalent professional staff, serving 17,772 gifted students (10.7% of the gifted enrollment).

Table 14 shows the reported expenditures for gifted education by funding source and dollar amount. The total state reimbursement was $10,049,851. This represents a statewide per pupil expenditure of $60.46 (state funds) compared to $61.49 in fiscal year 1991. The amount expended for gifted education from state funds increased by 3.5% from FY 91 to FY 92, and the state's portion of expenditures for gifted education decreased (from 18.5% to 15.0%).

Reported expenditures from local revenues were $56,026,761 (Table 14). This is an increase of 32.7% over last year's reported local contribution. Local funding represented 80.5% of expenditures for gifted education in FY 91 compared to 83.8% in FY 92. The per pupil expenditure from local funds was $337.03 compared to $267.41 last year.

Total reported expenditures for gifted education were $52,413,227 in fiscal year 1991 compared to $66,893,598 in fiscal year 1992. This represents an overall increase in reported expenditures for gifted education of approximately 27.6%.

Table 14: Reported Expenditures for Gifted Education by Funding Source

Funding Source	Amount	Percent	Cumulative Percent
Local	$56,026,761	83.76%	83.76%
State*	10,049,851	15.02%	98.78%
Federal	232,050	0.32%	99.13%
Special Grants	584,936	0.87%	100.00%
Total	$66,893,598		

NOTE: Percentages and figures have been rounded.

* State expenditures are reported via claims processed through the Reimbursement Section of the Illinois State Board of Education.

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

Illinois State Board of Education received data from 947 Illinois public school districts via the Gifted Education Program Evaluation Report (ISBE Form 41-61). With the exception of 19 reports ("Planning year only--no students served"), districts described their gifted program in terms of the students identified, the students participating, the demographic characteristics of students served, program type and content, staff training-- recipients, providers, and sources of funding-- and financial support for gifted education.

The following statements summarize gifted education programs as reported by Illinois' public school districts for school year 1991-92.

* The number of students **identified** increased by 3.5% when compared to 1990-91.

* The number of students **participating** increased by 5.3% when compared to 1990-91.

* Females outnumber males by a factor of 52.4% to 47.9%.

* In light of the racial/ethnic distribution of public school students, there are more whites and Asians in gifted education and fewer blacks and Hispanics.

* Gifted education programs were provided in all fundamental learning areas, as well as foreign language and multidisciplinary at all grade levels.

* Nearly all districts (99.8%) reported some participation in staff training.

* Teachers were the primary recipients of staff training. Educational Service Centers, local education agencies, and state/regional conferences were the primary providers of staff training; state funds and funding through local education agencies and Educational Service Centers were the primary sources of financing for staff training.

* Funding from state monies increased by 3.5% when compared to 1990-91.

* Overall expenditures for gifted education increased by 27.6% when compared to 1990-91.

The current evaluation process was not designed to measure the effectiveness of gifted education programs in terms of student performance outcomes. A more comprehensive evaluation system will be implemented in the future that will include recommendations from a comprehensive review of Illinois' Gifted Education Programs. The study, referenced first on page 10 of this report, was conducted by Evaluation Systems Design, Inc. (ESDI) and was presented to the Illinois State Board of Education in May 1993. If the annual evaluation is outcomes-based, ESDI recommended that districts be required to specify expected outcomes and that state funding should be based on specified outcomes rather than process objectives. In addition, future statewide evaluations should include an analysis of IGAP scores of gifted students. These recommendations, along with many others previously included in this report, are under

consideration by Illinois State Board of Education staff and management.

APPENDIX A

FY 92 GIFTED EDUCATION PROGRAM
EVALUATION REPORT

ISBE Form #41-61

ILLINOIS STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION
Planning, Research and Evaluation
100 North First Street
Springfield, Illinois 62777-0001

FY 92 GIFTED EDUCATION PROGRAM EVALUATION REPORT

(1-11)

INSTRUCTIONS: Complete and submit one copy of this report to the Illinois State Board of Education by June 30, 1992. If assistance is needed, call Evaluation Staff at 217/782-3950.

Report all gifted students identified, and/or participating in the program during the regular school year, irrespective of the funding source.

Do not include summer school gifted/remedial program information in this report.

PERSON(S) COMPLETING THIS REPORT

PHONE (Include area code)
( )

PART I. STUDENTS IDENTIFIED

Enter an unduplicated count of all students identified as gifted or talented in your school district.

GRADE LEVEL (12-13)	GENERAL INTELLECTUAL ABILITY (14-18)	SPECIFIC APTITUDE/ TALENT(S) (19-23)
OK		
01		
02		
03		
04		
05		
06		
07		
08		
09		
10		
11		
12		

PART II. STUDENTS PARTICIPATING

Enter an unduplicated count of all students who participated in your gifted/talented program during FY92 by grade level, gender and racial/ethnic group.

Racial/ethnic designations as used by the Illinois State Board of Education do not denote scientific definitions or anthropological origins. For purposes of this report, a student may be included in the group with which he or she identifies or appears to belong or the group to which he or she is regarded as belonging by the community.

GRADE LEVEL	RACIAL/ETHNIC GROUP AND GENDER										RAW TOTALS (74-78) (110) 1
	AMERICAN INDIAN OR ALASKAN NATIVE		ASIAN OR PACIFIC ISLANDER		BLACK, NOT HISPANIC		HISPANIC		WHITE, NOT HISPANIC		
	Male (24-28)	Female (29-33)	Male (34-38)	Female (39-43)	Male (44-48)	Female (49-53)	Male (54-58)	Female (59-63)	Male (64-68)	Female (68-73)	
OK											
01											
02											
03											
04											
05											
06											
07											
08											
09											
10											
11											
12											

ISBE 41-61 (10/91)

31

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

(1-11) REGION/COUNTY/DISTRICT CODE ___-___-___-___

PART III. STUDENTS IDENTIFIED VERSUS STUDENTS PARTICIPATING

If the number of students identified in Part I is greater than or less than the number of students participating as listed in Part II, give reasons for the difference.
(Please check all that apply.)

		Number			Number	
(12-15)	☐	____	Voluntary student withdrawal	(36-39) ☐	____	Insufficient resources
(16-19)	☐	____	Parent/guardian withdrawal	(40-43) ☐	____	Other (please specify) ____
(20-23)	☐	____	Moved out of district			____
(24-27)	☐	____	Transferred to a nonpublic school			____
(28-31)	☐	____	Dropped out			____
(32-35)	☐	____	Insufficient staff to conduct program			

PART IV. STUDENT RECRUITMENT

Using the list below, which sources are used to recruit gifted students?
(Please check all that apply.)

(44) ☐ District publications
(45) ☐ Newspaper
(46) ☐ Radio
(47) ☐ Television
(48) ☐ Public/philanthropic group (social service agency, church)
(49) ☐ Referred by district staff
(50) ☐ Referred by parent/guardian
(51) ☐ Self-referral
(52) ☐ Other (please specify) ____
____
____
____

PART V. SCREENING/SELECTION/PLACEMENT

Using the list below, which sources are used to screen/select/place students for the gifted program.
(Please check all that apply.)

OBJECTIVE MEASURES

(53) ☐ Teacher-made test
(54) ☐ Specific subject matter test
(55) ☐ Achievement test subscores
(56) ☐ Creativity test
(57) ☐ Pictorial/nonverbal/abstract reasoning test
(58) ☐ Individual intelligence test
(59) ☐ Group/verbal intelligence or mental ability test
(60) ☐ Rating scale
(61) ☐ Other (please specify) ____
____
____
____

PROFESSIONAL JUDGMENT

(62) ☐ Teacher/specialist professional judgment
(63) ☐ Past school performance
(64) ☐ Student accomplishment/ability (portfolio, audition, performance)
(65) ☐ Other (please specify) ____
____
____
____

PART VI. STAFF QUALIFICATIONS

How many staff are allocated to the gifted program? Express the number of full time equivalent (FTE) staff as a decimal, *(example: 2½ FTE's = 2.5)*.

(110) 2

	FTE'S		FTE'S		FTE'S	
(66-70)	____	Teachers	(76-80) ____	Coordinators	(86-90) ____	Social Workers, Nurses, Counselors, Psychologists
(71-75)	____	Aides, Assistants	(81-85) ____	Administrators	(91-95) ____	Support Staff

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

PART VII. GIFTED PROGRAM SUMMARY

(1-11) REGION/COUNTY/DISTRICT CODE

If entries are made in Part VII A, entries must also be made in the corresponding sections of Part VII B and Part VII C.

A. Enter the number of gifted students in each grade level enrolled in each program area. The number of students enrolled in <u>each program area</u> by grade level must be equal to or less than the total number of students in the same grade level listed in Part II, on page 1 of this form.

Grade Level (12-13)	Language Arts (14-17)	Mathematics (18-21)	Biological/ Physical Sciences (22-25)	Social Sciences (26-29)	Fine Arts (30-33)	Physical Development/ Health (34-37)	Foreign Language (38-41)	Multi-disciplinary (42-45)
OK								
01								
02								
03								
04								
05								
06								
07								
08								
09								
10								
11								
12								

(110) 3

33

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

PART VII. GIFTED PROGRAM SUMMARY (1-11) REGION/COUNTY/DISTRICT CODE

B. For each program area and grade level, enter the number code for the program type, instructional setting, hours per week and weeks per year. Use only one number code per box. If a learning area is offered in more than one combination of grade level, program type, instructional setting, hours per week and weeks per year, use the additional lines provided.

PROGRAM AREA (12)	Grade Level (13-14)	Program Type* (15)	Instructional Setting** (16)	Hours/Week (17)	Weeks/Year (18)
		1 = Acceleration 2 = Enrichment	1 = Pull-Out 2 = Self-Cont. 3 = Special Class 4 = Regular	0 = less than 1 1 = 1-5 2 = 6-10 3 = 11-15 4 = 16 or More	0 = less than 1 1 = 1-9 2 = 10-18 3 = 19-27 4 = 28-36
(A) Language Arts					
(B) Mathematics					
(Continued) (B) Mathematics					
(C) Biological/ Physical Sciences					
(D) Social Sciences					
(E) Fine Arts					
(F) Physical Development/ Health					
(G) Foreign Language					
(H) Multidisciplinary					

(110) 4

* **PROGRAM TYPE**

Acceleration - Curriculum provided for a student at an earlier age, at a more advanced level and at a faster pace than the traditional sequence, e.g., advanced class.

Enrichment - Study of special themes/topics in-depth and in greater intensity usually within the regular curriculum, e.g., in-depth unit requiring higher level thinking skills.

** **INSTRUCTIONAL SETTINGS**

Each instructional setting listed below describes an arrangement in which differentiated instructional services are provided for gifted/talented program students.

Pull-Out - On a regular basis, gifted/talented program students are "pulled-out" of their regular class and modification of instructional services are provided in another location, e.g., classroom, resource room or instructional materials center. These pull-out classes may contain multilevel grades or same grade groupings.

Self-Contained Gifted Classroom - Classroom (for all subjects) only for gifted students staffed by specially trained teacher.

Special Gifted Class - The gifted/talented student group is maintained for instruction in a departmentalized subject area, e.g. American history.

Regular Class - Differentiated instructional services are provided in the regular classroom by the regular classroom teachers simultaneously with non-gifted/ talented program students.

REGION/COUNTY/DISTRICT CODE (1-11) ☐☐-☐☐☐-☐☐☐☐-☐☐

PART VII. GIFTED PROGRAM SUMMARY (Continued)

C. Place an "X" in the box to indicate the curricula that were included in your gifted/talented program during FY92. Check all that apply.

LANGUAGE ARTS

(12) ☐ Creative, Expository Writing
(13) ☐ Literature
(14) ☐ Writing Skills, Composition
(15) ☐ Reading Comprehension
(16) ☐ Vocabulary
(17) ☐ Classical Mythology
(18) ☐ Speech
(19) ☐ Debate
(20) ☐ Research Paper Preparation
(21) ☐ Poetry
(22) ☐ Other _____

MATHEMATICS

(23) ☐ Arithmetic (K-8)
(24) ☐ Pre-Algebra
(25) ☐ Algebra
(26) ☐ College Algebra
(27) ☐ Geometry
(28) ☐ Logic
(29) ☐ Statistics
(30) ☐ Computer Programming
(31) ☐ Probability
(32) ☐ Trigonometry
(33) ☐ Calculus
(34) ☐ Computer Literacy/Appreciation
(35) ☐ Problem Solving
(36) ☐ Consumer Mathematics
(37) ☐ Other _____

MULTIDISCIPLINARY

(38) ☐ Language Arts
(39) ☐ Mathematics
(40) ☐ Social Sciences
(41) ☐ Biological/Physical Sciences
(42) ☐ Fine Arts
(43) ☐ Foreign Language

SOCIAL SCIENCES

(44) ☐ Political Science
(45) ☐ Psychology
(46) ☐ Sociology
(47) ☐ Anthropology
(48) ☐ Civics
(49) ☐ Consumer Education
(50) ☐ Economics
(51) ☐ U.S. History
(52) ☐ U.S. Geography
(53) ☐ Government
(54) ☐ World History
(55) ☐ World Geography
(56) ☐ Other _____

BIOLOGICAL/PHYSICAL SCIENCES

(57) ☐ Science (K-8)
(58) ☐ Biology
(59) ☐ Chemistry
(60) ☐ Physics
(61) ☐ Physiology/Anatomy
(62) ☐ Zoology
(63) ☐ Botany
(64) ☐ Astronomy
(65) ☐ Micro Biology
(66) ☐ Other _____

FOREIGN LANGUAGE

(67) ☐ French
(68) ☐ Spanish
(69) ☐ Italian
(70) ☐ Russian
(71) ☐ German
(72) ☐ Latin
(73) ☐ Hebrew
(74) ☐ Other _____

FINE ARTS

MUSIC

(75) ☐ Elements/Principles
(76) ☐ Historic/Cultural Study
(77) ☐ Performance, Instrumental
(78) ☐ Performance, Vocal
(79) ☐ Composition

VISUAL ARTS

(80) ☐ Elements/Principles
(81) ☐ Historic/Cultural Study
(82) ☐ Drawing
(83) ☐ Painting
(84) ☐ Printmaking
(85) ☐ Design
(86) ☐ Sculpture
(87) ☐ Crafts, Jewelry, Textiles, Ceramics

DANCE

(88) ☐ Elements/Principles
(89) ☐ Historical/Cultural Study
(90) ☐ Performance/Choreography

DRAMA/THEATRE

(91) ☐ Elements/Principles
(92) ☐ Historic/Cultural Study
(93) ☐ Performance (directing, acting, designing)
(94) ☐ Playwriting

MEDIA ARTS

(95) ☐ Computer Graphics
(96) ☐ Photography
(97) ☐ Film
(98) ☐ Other _____

PHYSICAL DEVELOPMENT/HEALTH (specify)

(99) ☐ _____
(100) ☐ _____
(101) ☐ _____
(102) ☐ _____
(103) ☐ _____ (110) 5

(1-11) REGION/COUNTY/DISTRICT CODE ☐☐-☐☐☐-☐☐☐☐-☐☐

PART VIII. STAFF TRAINING

In column A, enter the total number of personnel who participated in training sessions, inservice workshops, conferences or coursework pertaining to gifted education. In columns B-F, indicate the number of personnel participating by training providers. If "other" training provider has been indicated, please specify on the lines below. In columns G-J, indicate the number of personnel participating by funding source.

DISTRICT PERSONNEL	TOTAL NUMBER PERSONNEL PARTICIPATING IN GIFTED TRAINING	TRAINING PROVIDER					FUND SOURCE			
		STATE/ REGIONAL CONFERENCES	ESC	LEA	UNIVERSITY CREDIT COURSES	OTHER	LEA FUNDED	STATE FUNDED	FEDERALLY FUNDED	ESC FUNDED
(12)	A (13-17)	B (18-22)	C (23-26)	D (27-30)	E (31-34)	F (35-38)	G (39-42)	H (43-46)	I (47-50)	J (51-54)
(A) Teachers										(110) 6
(B) Aides, Assistants										
(C) Coordinator										
(D) Administrators										
(E) Counselors, Psychologists										
(F) Support Staff										

35

_____ _____ _____

Use this space to identify other training provider(s) indicated in column I above.

PART IX. FISCAL CONTRIBUTION

Enter the total expenditure of LEA funds for gifted education in your district. This total should include the actual local expenditure for instruction, improvement of instruction, and administration. Use the projected amount from your FY 92 Application for Gifted Education Reimbursement Program as a guide.

$_____
(12-22)

Enter the expenditure for gifted education received from other funding sources. Do not include your State grant in these figures.

Federal $_____
(23-33)

Special Grants $_____
(34-44)

47

(110) 7

PART X. CERTIFICATION

I certify that the information contained in this report is accurate and true to the best of my knowledge.

_____
Signature of District Superintendent

_____
Date

48

APPENDIX B
ILLINOIS GIFTED EDUCATION PROGRAM
DEFINITION OF TERMS
23 Illinois Administrative Code 227.10

Two identification categories of giftedness are established in the Illinois State Board of Education Gifted Education Rules.

GENERAL INTELLECTUAL ABILITY - The child possesses general intellectual ability, high-level thought processes (e.g., the ability to make valid generalizations about events, people and things), or divergent thinking (e.g., the ability to identify and consider multiple, valid solutions to a given problem) which are consistently superior to that of other children to the extent that he or she needs and can profit from specially planned educational services beyond those normally provided by the standard school program.

SPECIFIC APTITUDE/TALENT - The child possesses a specific aptitude/talent in a specific academic area, creativity or the arts, which is consistently superior to the aptitudes of other children to the extent that he or she needs and can profit from specially planned educational services beyond those normally provided by the standard school program.

The Gifted Education Evaluation Report Form lists two program types and four instructional settings that describe an arrangement in which differentiated instructional services are provided for gifted/talented program students.

PROGRAM TYPE
ACCELERATION - Curriculum provided for a student at an earlier age, at a more advanced level and at a faster pace than the traditional sequence, e.g., advanced class.

ENRICHMENT - Study of special themes/topics in-depth and in greater intensity usually within the regular curriculum, e.g., in-depth unit requiring higher-level thinking skills.

INSTRUCTIONAL SETTINGS
PULL-OUT - On a regular basis, gifted/talented program students are "pulled out" of their regular class, and differentiated instructional services are provided in another location, e.g., classroom, resource room or instructional materials center. These pull-out classes may contain multi-level grades or same-grade groupings.

SELF-CONTAINED GIFTED CLASSROOM - Classrooms only for gifted students staffed by specially trained teachers and offered in all curricular areas.

SPECIAL GIFTED CLASS - The gifted/talented student group is maintained for instruction in a departmentalized subject area, e.g. American History.

REGULAR CLASS - Differentiated instructional services are provided in the regular classroom by the regular classroom teacher simultaneously with non-gifted/talented program students.

APPENDIX C
GIFTED PROGRAM AREA/PROGRAM CONTENT

LANGUAGE ARTS

Creative, Expository Writing	632
Literature	588
Writing Skills, Composition	596
Reading Comprehension	527
Vocabulary	511
Classical Mythology	252
Speech	331
Debate	149
Research Paper Preparation	411
Poetry	438
Other	132

MATHEMATICS

Arithmetic (K-8)	443
Pre-Algebra	376
Algebra	401
College Algebra	136
Geometry	361
Logic	312
Statistics	162
Computer Programming	265
Probability	259
Trigonometry	177
Calculus	174
Computer Literacy/ Appreciation	314
Problem Solving	484
Consumer Mathematics	163
Other	69

MULTIDISCIPLINARY

Language Arts	360
Mathematics	303
Social Sciences	295
Biological/Physical Sciences	253
Fine Arts	216
Foreign Language	76

SOCIAL SCIENCES

Political Science	140
Psychology	81
Sociology	103
Anthropology	70
Civics	113
Consumer Education	137
Economics	124
U.S. History	285
U.S. Geography	207
Government	181
World History	208
World Geography	202
Other	57

BIOLOGICAL/PHYSICAL SCIENCES

Science (K-8)	323
Biology	267
Chemistry	241
Physics	224
Physiology/Anatomy	86
Zoology	87
Botany	85
Astronomy	87
Microbiology	29
Other	73

FOREIGN LANGUAGE

French	116
Spanish	178
Italian	7
Russian	7
German	60
Latin	30
Hebrew	3
Other	19

FINE ARTS

MUSIC

Elements/Principles	102
Historic/Cultural Study	77
Performance, Instrumental	183
Performance, Vocal	172
Composition	35

VISUAL ARTS

Elements/Principles	137
Historic/Cultural Study	121
Drawing	244
Painting	193
Printmaking	56
Design	152
Sculpture	108
Crafts, Jewelry, Textiles, Ceramics	99

DANCE

Elements/Principles	35
Historic/Cultural Study	18
Performance/Choreography	61

DRAMA/THEATRE

Elements/Principles	91
Historic/Cultural Study	40
Performance (directing, acting, designing)	189
Playwriting	76

MEDIA ARTS

Computer Graphics	95
Photography	55
Film	36
Other	113

NOTE: Data presented in Appendix C represent the number of districts offering classes (as reported on Part VIII C and ISBE Form #41-61.)

re\006bp

WORLD-CLASS EDUCATION FOR THE 21ST CENTURY: THE CHALLENGE AND THE VISION

VISION STATEMENT

As we approach the 21st century, there is broad-based agreement that the education we provide for our children will determine America's future role in the community of nations, the character of our society, and the quality of our individual lives. Thus, education has become the most important responsibility of our nation and our state, with an imperative for bold new directions and renewed commitments.

To meet the global challenges this responsibility presents, the State of Illinois will provide the leadership necessary to guarantee access to a system of high-quality public education. This system will develop in all students the knowledge, understanding, skills and attitudes that will enable all residents to lead productive and fulfilling lives in a complex and changing society. All students will be provided appropriate and adequate opportunities to learn to:

- communicate with words, numbers, visual images, symbols and sounds;
- think analytically and creatively, and be able to solve problems to meet personal, social and academic needs;
- develop physical and emotional well-being;
- contribute as citizens in local, state, national and global communities;
- work independently and cooperatively in groups;
- understand and appreciate the diversity of our world and the interdependence of its peoples;
- contribute to the economic well-being of society; and
- continue to learn throughout their lives.

MISSION STATEMENT

The State Board of Education believes that the current educational system is not meeting the needs of the people of Illinois. Substantial change is needed to fulfill this responsibility. The State Board of Education will provide the leadership necessary to begin this process of change by committing to the following goals.

ILLINOIS GOALS

1. Each Illinois public school student will exhibit mastery of the learner outcomes defined in the State Goals for Learning, demonstrate the ability to solve problems and perform tasks requiring higher-order thinking skills, and be prepared to succeed in our diverse society and the global work force.

2. All people of Illinois will be literate, lifelong learners who are knowledgeable about the rights and responsibilities of citizenship and able to contribute to the social and economic well-being of our diverse, global society.

3. All Illinois public school students will be served by an education delivery system which focuses on student outcomes; promotes maximum flexibility for shared decision making at the local level; and has an accountability process which includes rewards, interventions and assistance for schools.

4. All Illinois public school students will have access to schools and classrooms with highly qualified and effective professionals who ensure that students achieve high levels of learning.

5. All Illinois public school students will attend schools which effectively use technology as a resource to support student learning and improve operational efficiency.

6. All Illinois public school students will attend schools which actively develop the support, involvement and commitment of their community by the establishment of partnerships and/or linkages to ensure the success of all students.

7. Every Illinois public school student will attend a school that is supported by an adequate, equitable, stable and predictable system of finance.

8. Each child in Illinois will receive the support services necessary to enter the public school system ready to learn and progress successfully through school. The public school system will serve as a leader in collaborative efforts among private and public agencies so that comprehensive and coordinated health, human and social services reach children and their families.

Developed by citizens of Illinois through a process supported by the Governor, the Illinois State Board of Education and the Illinois Business Roundtable. Adopted as a centerpiece for school improvement efforts.

Printed by the authority of the State of Illinois.

Recycle this
recycled paper

PRINTED WITH
SOY INK

BULK RATE
U.S. POSTAGE
PAID
Permit No
805
Springfield, IL

ILLINOIS STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION
100 North First Street, Springfield, Illinois 62777-0001

Michael W. Skarr, *Chairperson*
Robert Leininger, *State Superintendent*

An Equal Opportunity/Affirmative Action Employer
Printed by the Authority of the State of Illinois
January 1994 1100 426B-15 No.214